

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present submission is responsive to the Final Office Action of August 7, 2007, in which claims 1-9 and 11 are presently pending. A courtesy copy of the pending claims is provided herein.

In response to Applicants' amendment dated June 12, 2007, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) as introducing new matter into the disclosure. Further, with regard to the remaining pending claims, claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11 have now been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,442,752 to Jennings, et al., in view of U.S. Patent 5,872,973 to Mitchell, et al. In addition, claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings in view of Mitchell, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,735,598 to Srivastava, et al. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Upon a careful review of the grounds of both the new matter objection and the §103 rejections of the remaining claims based on the newly cited Mitchell reference, it is quite apparent that these objections/rejections are the result of the Examiner's error in reading the claim language of the amendment filed on June 12, 2007. As indicated at several points in the Final Office Action, the Examiner repeatedly uses the term interactively, when in fact the Applicants' claims actually recite the term iteratively, which has a completely different meaning. Whereas the term "interactively" may refer to the exchange of information or instructions between a person and a machine, the term "iteratively" refers to something that is done repeatedly, over and over again.

It is abundantly clear from a review of the Mitchell reference, as well as the Examiner's analysis of the portions of the Mitchell reference relied upon (e.g., page 6 of

the Final Office Action) that amended claims have not been properly interpreted and reconsidered prior to issuance of the present Final Office Action. As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the finality of the present Office Action under MPEP 706.07(d), and reconsideration of the application as was amended on June 12, 2007. The Applicants, in filing the present response, respectfully submit that they have not raised any new issues for consideration.

The Applicants further reiterate that with regard to the claim rejections based on the art of record, each of independent claims 1, 9 and 11 were previously amended to more particularly point out that the compiling and linking of the source file is done iteratively to create a single executable file based on at least one of variations, characteristics, and parameters for each attribute. Support for this amendment is found at least in specification paragraph [0028], as well as in Figures 2 and 4 of the drawings. For example, in Figure 4, the single DLL executable 54 includes two versions of three functions: abc, abc', def, def', ghi, ghi'.

In addition to claims 1, 9 and 11, specification paragraphs [0005], [0009], [0018], [0019] and the Abstract were amended to provide consistency with the amended claims. Further, Table 3 of specification paragraph [0028] has been amended to correct typographical errors found therein. For purposes of clarity, the tables included in specification paragraphs [0019], [0021], [0028] and [0040] have been labeled as Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4, respectively.

In the present claims, and absent from the teachings of the Jennings, Mitchell or Srivastava references, compiling results in a unique function (contained in an executable object), for each combination of characteristics and parameters, and all of the unique functions are linked into the single executable (DLL). For a given application, selection is then made of only one of these, according to the combination of characteristics and parameters of that application. As discussed in paragraph [0028], each of the iterations of the functions, which are all in the same single executable library (DLL), have unique attributes.

In contrast, the output of the compile and link process in Jennings is separate DLLs, as opposed to a single DLL in the instant application. Stated another way, the concept of a single DLL, containing multiple instances of a function(s), is unique with respect to the cited art of record. Accordingly, since neither Jennings nor Srivastava teach or suggest "compiling and linking said source file iteratively to create a single executable file based on said at least one of variations, characteristics, and parameters for each said attribute," it is respectfully submitted that the previous §102 and §103 rejections have been overcome. As also indicated above, the Applicants further respectfully submit that the new matter objections to the specification are improper and should be withdrawn.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,  
ANUJA DEEDWANIYA, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By



Sean F. Sullivan  
Registration No. 38,328  
Customer No. 46429

Date: September 4, 2007  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929